



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,901	03/26/2004	Hiraku Murayama	018961-068	7688
21839	7590	07/14/2008		
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404				EXAMINER
				HOEKSTRA, JEFFREY GERBEN
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3736		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/14/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief		Application No. 10/809,901	Applicant(s) MURAYAMA ET AL.
		Examiner JEFFREY G. HOEKSTRA	Art Unit 3736
<p>–The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –</p> <p>THE REPLY FILED 24 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.</p> <p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p> <p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p> <p>NOTICE OF APPEAL</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p> <p>AMENDMENTS</p> <p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p> <p>NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____. </p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p> <p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p> <p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p> <p>Claim(s) allowed: _____. Claim(s) objected to: _____. Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4 and 7-14</u>. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____. </p> <p>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</p> <p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p> <p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p> <p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p> <p>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</p> <p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p> <p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached <i>Information Disclosure Statement(s)</i>. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____</p> <p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. </p> <p>/Max Hindenburg/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3736</p>			

Continuation of 3. NOTE:

The Foreign References cited and provided with the IDS filed 06/24/08 would require further search and/or consideration in a patentability determination as they have not previously been considered on the merits .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant argues the anticipatory rejection of the claims under Chandrasekaran, specifically arguing Chandrasekaran fails to disclose, teach, and/or fairly suggest a composite guidewire, comprising inter alia: an intermediate layer formed of a mixture of the first and second materials. The Examiner disagrees, maintains the rejection as broadly as structurally claimed and as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed 03/24/08, and in response notes the following: Chandrasekaran discloses and shows the cited intermediate layer (48) (as best seen in figure 5 (column 4 line 66 - column 5 line 10)). Moreover, the Examiner notes Applicant appears to rely heavily upon the claimed limitation "an intermediate layer formed of a mixture of said first material and said second material". This limitation appears to define the guidewire by structure resulting from the process by which it is "formed" and as such may to constitute a product-by-process limitation. The Examiner notes 1) product-by-process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only to the structure implied by the steps (MPEP 2112.01 and 2113) and 2) Attorney's arguments are not the kind of factual evidence that is required to rebut a *prima facie* case against a product-by-process limitation (MPEP 2145). With respect to 1), the Examiner maintains and reiterates as set forth above Chandrasekaran disclose and shows the structure implied by the claim language.